



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

this is the harshest of all opinions that he has found concerning him. If Dr. Holbrook will reread my preface he will find that Miss Wilde was the granddaughter and not the daughter of Richard Henry Wilde and so, of course, the estimate of Kirkup was more of a family tradition than a direct quotation from the collaborator with Kirkup himself. I may add that in my original manuscript, written fifteen years ago, after several interviews with my informant, the statement was still stronger and that it was toned down to the published form at the suggestion of Charles Eliot Norton, who did me the favor of going over this *opusculum juventutis*. The naïve reference to "another American of greater fame," which follows in Dr. Holbrook's note, leaves it uncertain whether he is paying Richard Henry Wilde, Miss Wilde or myself the compliment of comparison with Nathaniel Hawthorne.

THEODORE W. KOCH.

University of Michigan.

---

HENRI LAVEDAN, *Le Duel*, edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by STEPHEN H. BUSH. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1911. 16mo., x + 218 pp.

It hardly needs demonstration that this *drame passionnel*, while pointing a moral, can have but a limited sphere of usefulness in the American classroom. One has only to read the second scene of the first act, with its description of the vices of a *dégénéré héréditaire* and its exposition of the doctrine of *le droit à l'amour*, to perceive that it would be inadvisable to put the book in the hands of any but mature students, and, at that, only in connection with some special course on the modern French drama. Even from this point of view, the value of *Le Duel* is open to some question. As a modern adaptation of the classic ideal of a *crise psychologique*, this play is probably one of the best among those relatively unobjectionable from the American point of view; but it may fairly be doubted whether, in spite of its initial vogue, it will have other than a comparatively ephemeral career. The miscreant doctor's crude and brutal

cynicism, unrelieved by wit or *finesse*, makes one of the protagonists anything but an attractive character, while there is a fundamental *vice de construction* in the *dénouement*, a *deus-ex-machina* cutting of the knot that leaves the human problem as unsolved as before. As in the duel of the comic papers, the bystanders suffer the chief damage, while the real point at issue remains untouched.

The introduction to the present edition is well-written, and more readable than is often the case with similar compositions. There is, perhaps, a disproportionate space given up to the analysis of another of Lavedan's plays—the connection with *Le Duel* not being clear—and one could have wished for some other conclusion than a mere chronological recapitulation of his works; but the introductory chapter will, on the whole, invite the attention of the student and leave him with a fair idea of Lavedan's literary activities.

TEXT.—Comparison with the French original<sup>1</sup> shows that the text has been reproduced without abridgement or alteration, even in the case of palpable errors; cf. 7, 3, *interviewer*; 68, 4, *et* for *en* (see the second and fourth lines following); 108, 10, *Mai si!*; 123, 6 (and vocabulary, s. v. *part*), *De quel part*.<sup>2</sup> The punctuation of the French edition is followed, even to preserving certain oddities of doubtful status, and some evi-

<sup>1</sup> Paris: Ollendorff, 1907, 17ème Edition.

<sup>2</sup> These typographical errors are not in the original: 6, 13; 42, 13 and 136, 10, *la* for *le*.—116, 13, *commence*: read *commerce*.—151, 8, insert *deux* after *tous*.—157, 14, *elle*: read *celle*.—Page 11, in the sentence, *Il a reconquis . . . assez de . . . volonté pour qu'il ne soit très dangereux de le tenir enfermé . . .* either *ne* should be omitted, which is strictly the correct idiom, or *pas* should be inserted after *soit*, as in the original, in which construction *assez* has acquired by "contamination" somewhat the value of *trop*. Page 172, note 29, 10, *qu'* has been omitted before *on*. Page 175, note 91, 9, in the text *Monsieur* has no capital. In the vocabulary, "affair" (English) and *Henri* (French) are misspelled; an accent is *de trop* on *avancer*, and missing on *présenter*, *sortilège*, *témoigner*; the designation "*f.*" after *prévoir* should be omitted, and the punctuation of "*m: f.*" after *prisonnier* made to conform with the system employed elsewhere; *sauvegarde* should not be hyphenated, while *peut-être* should. Why dignify *Mesdames* with a capital if not *messieurs*? Moreover neither word occurs in the text.

dent mistakes.<sup>3</sup> A curious departure from the original, however, is the frequent use of four *points suspensifs*, usually at the end of a sentence, but often in the middle (e. g., 28, 21; 91, 4). French usage allows but three, even when one of them is properly the period that closes the sentence.

NOTES.<sup>4</sup>—In the editing of a text for class use, the delicate question as to what passages call for explanation in the notes is one on which probably no two editors would entirely agree. From the point of view, however, of the degree of proficiency that could fairly be expected of the classes that will read *Le Duel*, some of the notes in the book under consideration are obviously too elementary; for example: 8, 2, *Comment va-t-il?* "How is he?"—13, 16, "le is commonly thus used to refer back to some word or phrase."—98, 2, *qu'éprouve mon mari*; the student should by this time be beyond the stage where such a simple case of this inversion causes him any "discomforture."

On the other hand, many allusions and expres-

<sup>3</sup> In one case at least (96, 10), missing punctuation has been supplied, a precedent that might well have been followed elsewhere, as: a comma is required after *repos*, 25, 9; *mère*, 110, 4; *dme* and *toi*, 112, 11,—an interrogation mark after *Qui*, 93, 8, and *quoi*, 120, 3. The capital letter is out of place, 29, 1 and 113, 7 (cf. 91, 6); 114, 18; 119, 10. One is tempted to read *qu'est-ce qui* 48, 1. Missing accents and errors of punctuation, original with the American edition, are numerous. Cf. 20, 2 (the semi-colon should be a comma), 75, 1, *desir* (the more common accented form is used everywhere else); page 79, 11th line of the stage directions; 104, 1; 106, 9; 114, 1; 142, 1; 144, 9. In this connection, it must be admitted that, as a piece of book-making, the present volume is decidedly below the standard to which this house has accustomed us. Spacing, alignment and folding are defective, and imperfect type abounds (41, 12; 44, 18; 162, 7). The omission of the period in stage directions would be less disconcerting if it were more uniform (cf. pages 166, 168, 169).

<sup>4</sup> Apropos of notes in general, the question is pertinent whether it is not more rational to indicate by some means, in the text itself, the passages that are explained in the notes. The latter having been devised to aid the student, it would seem but consistent to inform him at once when this aid is to be had, and thus save needless labor where a note exists, or fruitless looking for one that does not. (Cf. pages 3-22 of *Le Cid* as published by the same house.)

sions that would certainly not be clear to most students are passed over without mention, such as: 6, 6, *on ne visite pas*; this means here specifically: "This establishment is not open to the public."—12, 6, *qu'on a l'air d'y tenir*, "as one likes to make out."—12, 16, *Ce sont des regrets en moins, allez!*—*Ou en plus*. "Well, just so much the less to regret." "Or so much the more."—Page 26, stage directions, line 6, *donner le bras à qq'un* has come, by a peculiar transfer, to mean "take some one's arm," which is evidently the sense called for in the case of the crippled bishop.—69, 14, *Je n'en sais rien!* "I am not so sure."—122, 2, *il ne reçoit pas* is a social formula, equivalent to our "he begs to be excused."—37, 9, *pêché immortel*; 41, 10, *violet, rouge*; 63, 15, *pêche miraculeuse* (vocabulary, "miraculous fishing"); 115, 11, *mûr pour Notre-Dame*; 158, 18, *livre d'heures*: these allusions would probably be missed by most students. The list might be considerably prolonged.

In the proper translation of any dialogue, a very real difficulty lies hidden in the frequently recurring adverbial expressions, interjections and incomplete phrases, which, simple enough in appearance, are by no means always easy to interpret, and "a literal translation of which . . . is ruinous to the sense" (note 16, 12). A few of those occurring in the present text are explained in notes or vocabulary, but the majority have been left unnoticed, as, for example: 14, 2 and 23, 8, *En attendant*, "Be that as it may."—15, 11, *Vous trouvez?* (vocabulary, "find"), "Do you really think so?" (cf. 52, 10).—17, 13, *Parfaitement!* (vocabulary, "perfectly"), "Most certainly!" and 50, 2, "Just so."—29, 13, *et encore*, "and even then."—56, 5, *Décidément!* "Well, I declare!"—81, 11, *Puisque je vous avais dit . . .*, "But I told you . . ."—119, 10, *hier encore, tiens!* "why even yesterday."

Even in the notes that are given, many statements are incorrect or misleading; among others, the following: 19, 6. *Attendre*, in the sense of "expect," is not "rare" with a personal object.—21, 3. *Il ne fallait pas tant me le prouver* means, "You should not have proved it to me so often." The meaning given, "It did not take so much," would have required *pour* before the infinitive.—21, 5. This use of the interrogation point is not,

as the note implies, general in French typography, but is a *tic* of M. Lavedan or of his printer, as will be seen from the following examples: 132, 9, *Vous ? Une duchesse ! millionnaire ?* 149, 7, *Emmenez-moi ! Ayez pitié ?* 153, 1, *Attendez ? Pas encore ? Au moins restez ? Ne me quittez pas ? Assistez à cet entretien ?*<sup>5</sup>—29, 10. There is no "delightful confusion," but only modest deprecation in the Bishop's remarks, which should be translated: "Why, I couldn't get over my surprise! You get an exaggerated idea of a thing beforehand, but when it really comes . . ."—30, 7. The correct reference is Luke, II, 29.—81, 1. *ce tantôt* is a popular expression meaning "this afternoon."—91, 9. *monsieur a raison*. The Duchess is speaking to the *abbé*, as is shown by the expression *chez vous*. The third person in direct address being used only toward those of superior rank, it would be impossible in the mouth of a duchess, addressing the doctor of an insane asylum. The correct translation here is: "This gentleman is right."—97, 20. This expression should be noted where it is first met with, 83, 20.—102, 11. The term *mea culpa* refers, not to the words, but to the gesture that habitually accompanies them, made by striking the breast with the tips of the fingers brought together. (Cf. the rest of the sentence: *dont vous vous frappez la poitrine, au lieu d'en arracher l'amour, l'y enfoncent, à coups de marteau*!)—119, 10. The translation suggested does not fit the context. The correct version has been given above in another connection.—125, 18. *Bien le respect* is distinctly a servant's form of leave-taking and should be translated as such. The French idiom corresponding to "with all due respect" is *sauf votre respect*.—149, 11. *dans le temps* means "in olden times." "In its day" is *en son temps*. The connection with note 13, 16 ("*le* is commonly thus used to refer back to some word or phrase") is not clear.

VOCABULARY.—The need of a vocabulary for the text in hand is not obvious. Students mature

<sup>5</sup>In some instances, this device is anomalous in the extreme, as, for example, in the case of a reply to a question (43, 3), or where the speaker expressly says: "*Je ne te demande pas . . .*" (90, 7). Cf. also 140, 2: *Mon frère ne s'est pas privé de remuer exprès, de sa main savante, cette boue endormie de ma jeunesse ?*

enough to read with profit a problem play of this character should not require to be told that *au* = *à + le* and *du* = *de + le*, that *crois* is from *croire* and *ceux* from *celui*, nor that *absence*, *absolution*, *accent* mean the same in French as in English. Moreover, the student should be encouraged, as early as possible, to use a dictionary—preferably an all-French dictionary at this stage of his work—both for the valuable mental exercise of selecting the appropriate definition, and in order to grasp, for each new word, the essential rather than some special meaning.<sup>6</sup> For *Le Duel*, a vocabulary was unnecessary, if not indeed inadvisable; ampler notes covering the more difficult expressions would have been sufficient.

The present vocabulary gives evidence of having been compiled with a meticulousness that deserved to be better employed.<sup>7</sup> Such familiar variants as *j'*, *t'*, *l'on*, are painstakingly noted, as well as most of the irregular verb-forms contained in the text, including the well-known parts of *aller*, *devoir*, *falloir*, etc. Notes explaining proper names and idioms are reproduced, often *in toto*, in the vocabulary, the idioms sometimes under both the principal component words. (E. g., *non plus*; *pourquoi faire ?*)<sup>8</sup> An unfortunate habit is that of citing an idiom, not in its most general form, but in the particular one that occurs in the text. (Cf. *cas*,

<sup>6</sup>A striking example of this latter point is the word *aboutir*, defined in the vocabulary of *Le Duel* as "to come to the point." While this definition happens to fit the context (52, 21), it would be unfortunate for the student to get the impression that it represents the true meaning of the word. Cf. also *trouble* and *troubler*, defined as "trouble."

<sup>7</sup>The following omissions have, however, been noted, besides those mentioned elsewhere in this article: *çà* /, *Christ*, *confidence*, *contigu*, *efficace*, *élite*, *frissonner*, *que* = "why?" (42, 9), *qui* = "what?" (70, 7), *scrupuleux*, *te*, *tenez* /, *à travers*; the idioms, *par calcul*, *à plaisir*, *de trop*; the adjectives, *affolant*, *chinoïse*, *courant*, *croyant*, *idéal*, *mourant*, *saint*, *trouble*, *vivant*. Also, the following definitions should be added to those given: *aspirer*, draw in, quaff (75, 11 vs. *aspirer à*, 96, 3); *condition*, social position; *droit*, erect, stiff; *être*, to go; *faute*, sin, mistake; *perdre*, ruin, waste; *poignée*, handful; *regretter*, miss, long for; *rendre*, make; *suite*, sequel; the substantival use of *monsieur*, *petit*; the transitive value of *désespérer*, and the intransitive meaning of *ressusciter*.

<sup>8</sup>The device of thus translating an idiom in every place where it may reasonably be looked for is, doubtless, often a time-saver for the student, but surely it is supererogatory in such cases as *billet de banque* and *cabinet de travail*.

. . . le—qu'en font les hommes.) The consequence is such inaccuracies as "s'y attendre, to expect," "s'en réjouir, to rejoice." For the same reason, the special definitions given for *vous en savez plus long, leur obligé, grande ouverte* do not properly cover respectively *en sait plus long* (60, 18), *ton obligée* (57, 1), *grands ouverts* (164, 11).<sup>9</sup>

A more serious defect is the general lack of system in the construction of the vocabulary. Such items as *Légion d'honneur, Saint-Germain, Sainte-Marie-des-Marteaux* belonged more properly in the notes, where similar explanations are numerous. In some cases, two different functions of a word are grouped indiscriminately, as *leur*, personal and possessive pronoun. This is particularly the case with the adjectival and substantival uses of the same word. In some cases, they are printed separately (*intérieur*); in others, they are indicated by the designation *m. adj.* (*savant*), or *m., f., adj.* (*ennemi*), or by such a device as "*dévo*t, devout, devout person," "*isolé*, isolated (man)"; in other instances, again, this distinction is ignored entirely (*mort*, 148, 7; 162, 14,—*détaché*, 115, 16; 165, 10), which would probably have been the better plan in nearly every case. We find *j'* and *l'*, as above mentioned, but not *m'*, *s'*, *t'*; *nos*, but not *vos*; the feminine of *client, croyant, odieux*, but not of *présent, payant, orgueilleux*, etc., although the latter are met with in the text. *Nôtre* comes before *notre*, but *vôtre* after *votre*. We are told the plural of *chapeau*, which does not occur in the play, but not that of *vitrail*, which does. The pronominal use of some verbs is given; it is omitted with others where it is essential (*absenter, efforcer, méfier, méprendre, obstiner*), or where it has a peculiar value (*abreuver, complaire, tordre*, etc.). *Auteuil* is given in the notes alone, *Saint-Germain* in the vocabulary, *Grenelle* in both, and *Notre-Dame* in neither.

The definitions themselves are in a large number of cases inadequate or incorrect. In general, only one meaning is given for each word, and in nearly every case it is the English homonym where one exists. This results not only in conveying a false impression of the style (cf. *pulsa-*

*tions*, "pulsations" vs. "beats," 35, 8; *contraindre*, "constrain" vs. "force," 53, 13), but in definitions unsuited to the context, as, for example, to "address" a glance (*passim*), to "commit" a lie (70, 7), a mistake (96, 10). This is the more surprising as the editor himself has sounded a warning note (see n. 84, 3) as to "the numerous French words different in meaning from the allied or derived English word."

The definitions which, while correct in themselves, do not meet the text, are too numerous to be cited here.<sup>10</sup> The student who uses the vocabulary conscientiously will be rewarded with such combinations as these: 9, 16, "vile and hasty enjoyments."—11, 4, "keep him enclosed in this asylum."—12, 4, "I am devoted to misfortune."—28, 9, "I have a bad head" (I am pigheaded).—37, 15, "pass the water again" (cross the seas once more, go back overseas).—47, 1, The doctor is "laborious."—67, 17, "Our two sadnesses behave and correspond."—Page 136, The bishop motions to the servant that he can "introduce" the *abbé* . . . "The *abbé* is introduced."

Several definitions could well have been rendered more precise: *administrer*, to administer the sacrament to; (*sœur*) *converse*, lay sister; *dizaine*, decade (of Aves); *fondation*, endowed institution; *œuvre*, charity (85, 13, vs. 145, 11); *patronage*, Children's Aid Society; *retraite, faire une* —, make a (religious) retreat. Others, again, contain shortcuts liable to mislead the student, e. g.: *avoir*, "to be the matter with" (25, 6); *devenir*, "to become of" (22, 14); *entourer*, "to put around" (30, 14). It might be mentioned also that neither notes nor vocabulary throw any light on the value of such peculiar plurals as: *approches*, 83, 12; *convoitises*, 42, 8; *courages*, 149, 7, and 163, 14; *impatiences*, 18, 6; *pitiés*, 164, 2; *sollicitudes*, 71, 10.

Of the erroneous definitions, which are numerous, the following are among the most important:

<sup>9</sup> Cf. in this connection: "*convers, sœur* —"; "*jour, . . . huit, quinze* —"; "*mien, . . . les* —"; "*ouvert, . . . grande* —"; "*rameau, . . . les* —" (*Rameaux*).

<sup>10</sup> Some of the more important of these cases are: *client*, patient (110, 13, cf. 54, 12); *confusion*, embarrassment (126, 5); *déception*, disappointment (13, 8); *endormir*, anaesthetize (29, 9); *exempt*, lacking in (47, 20); *faissable*, why not "feasible"? (54, 16); *galerie*, hall; *impassible*, impassive (page 163, last line); *instant* is oftener the equivalent of the English "moment" (cf. 24, 10; 135, 1; 154, 4).

*actuellement*, "actually."—*affût*. The idiom à l'*affût de* is derived, not from "gun carriage," but from the sense of "poste derrière un arbre pour guetter" (Dict. Gén.).—*aise*. In the expression *j'en suis bien aise*, we have the adj., not the subst.—*armoire-bibliothèque*, "secretary" (book-case).—*d'autant que*, "insomuch as" (the more so as, 52, 4).—*avant*, "in front of." Its use in this sense has not been found in the text.—*bahut*, "chest" (cabinet, p. 79; cf. "à deux corps").—*dévo*t, "devout." "Pious" renders better the hypocritical shading of this word in French.—*dispensaire*, "dispensatory" (dispensary).—*enfin que*, "in order that" (96, 13, anyhow, that . . . ; 125, 15, in short, that . . . *Afin que* does not occur in the text.)—*Grandeur*, "Grandeur (title)." A bishop is addressed as "Your Grace," or in England, "My Lord" or "Your Lordship."—*impérieux*, "imperious" (imperative: *un impérieux devoir*, 88, 6).—*infranchissable*, "impassable" (that cannot be bridged or crossed: *d'infranchissables distances*, 115, 2).—*intérieur* is masc.—*meuble*, "furniture" (piece of furniture; cf. the plural, 79, 3).—*momentanément*, "momentarily" (temporarily, 10, 17).—*monseigneur*, "My Lord (title given to bishop)." This expression is not used in America; cf. *Grandeur*, *supra*.—*nunc dimittis*. The verb is not imperative.—*personne*, "f., person, nobody," is masc. in the latter sense.—*pieux*, "pious" (religious; cf. *dévo*t, *supra*).—*pleur*, "f., tear" (masc., weeping; pl., tears).—*reproche* is masc.—"saute, f., health" is evidently an erroneous repetition of *santé*.—*songeux*. The masc. is *songeur*.—"*stupéfaire*, to stupefy," does not exist except in the past participle.—*tantôt*, "just now" (a short while ago; vs. *tout à l'heure*).—*en travers de*, "through" (across, blocking, 93, 1).

It hardly needs to be said, in conclusion, that a thorough revision of this text-book is imperative before it can be used with satisfaction. The vocabulary should be omitted altogether, for the reasons stated above. It will then remain to be seen whether, upon trial in the class room, *Le Duel* will be found to have any lasting value, either intrinsically or as representing some phase in the progress of French drama in the early twentieth century.

FREDERICK A. BLOSSOM.

The Johns Hopkins University.

*Materials for the Study of the English Drama (excluding Shakespeare). A Selected List of Books in The Newberry Library.* The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois. 8vo., vii, 89. 50 cents.

As the title-page indicates, this admirable little bibliography is intended primarily for the convenience of students of the English Drama using the Newberry Library, but its excellence ensures it a usefulness far larger than its compiler anticipated for it. The fact that this is a selected list of works for the student of the drama is the key to its value. There are many more inclusive bibliographies dealing with the English Drama, or with particular periods or authors, but there is no list known to the reviewer covering practically the whole field (except Shakespeare) at once so full, so compact, and compiled with so much judgment and understanding as to what books are really helpful to the student. Many will regret that Shakespeare has not been included, and that only a few authors of the so-called "poetic" drama have been entered. We are, however, led to hope for a Shakespeare list at no very distant day, and probably the contention that present-day interest is centered chiefly in the "acted" drama is correct. Certainly within its sphere and within its scope the list is excellent.

The works included are classified under the following heads: Bibliography; Periodicals, Societies, and Associations; History, Theory, and Criticism; Biography, General and Collective; Biography and Criticism, Individual; Dramas and Plays, Collected Works and Editions of Single Plays by Individual Authors, including Anonymous Dramas; History of the Stage and Theatre in the United States; American Dramatists, Collected Works and Editions of Single Plays, Anonymous Dramas. A full index is provided.

Experience in a great Library gives an excellent training for work of this kind, and one can readily believe that this convenient List includes only those works that have been shown to be of most use to the largest number of persons engaged in the study of the English Drama.

This is Number 1 of the "Publications of the